REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-16, 18, 20 and 22-34 are pending, in which claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 23, 29 and 30 are currently amended. Claims 17, 19 and 21 were previously canceled.

The final Office Action mailed June 17, 2005 rejected claims 1-16, 18, 20 and 22-35 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Gelman et al.* (US 6,415,329) in view of *Albert et al.* (US 6,742,045).

In the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29. Amended claims 1 and 29 recite "**tearing down, during a predetermined period, the unspoofed connection** based upon the identifying step" and "restarting a spoofed connection between the second platform and a host, wherein the second platform serves as a redundant platform for the first platform, and **the predetermined period is set to minimize delay for restarting of the spoofed connection.**" Independent claim 8 recites "a second platform configured to communicate with the remote platform upon failure of the first platform to communicate with the remote platform, the second platform being configured to identify a message received from a local host over unspoofed connection according to a prescribed protocol as an unspoofed message, **wherein the second platform terminates, during a predetermined period, the unspoofed connection in response to the identified message to avoid delaying startup of a spoofed connection with the remote platform.**" Claim 15, as amended, recites "wherein **unspoofed messages are forwarded after a predetermined period to avoid delaying the restart of the spoofed connection.**" Claim 22 recites "**means for tearing down, during a predetermined period, the connection** based upon the identified message" and "means for restarting a spoofed connection upon detection of the redundancy switch condition, **wherein the predetermined period is set to minimize delay for restarting of the spoofed connection.**"

Applicants respectfully submit that the above features are absent from the applied references of *Gelman et al.* and *Albert et al.*, individually or in combination.

Furthermore, Applicants maintain that the arguments proffered in Applicants' prior Response regarding the Examiner's interpretation of "termination" is still valid. That is, the cited passage of col. 9: 66 – col. 10:8 of *Gelman et al.* utilizes the term "terminate" in the sense of an endpoint of a connection: "terminated by the TCP/IP protocols on the gateway."

Accordingly, a *prima facie* of obviousness thus has not been established. Applicants respectfully urge the indication that independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29 are allowable. Additionally, dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16, 18, 20, 23-28 and 30-35 are allowable at least for the reasons put forth for the allowability of their corresponding independent claims.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (301) 601-7252 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

12-8-2005

Craig L. Plastrik
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,254